

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,993	01/21/2004		Neng-Kuo Chen	JCLA12335	4304
23900	7590	09/30/2005		· EXAMINER	
J C PATEN			DEO, DUY VU NGUYEN		
4 VENTURE, SUITE 250 IRVINE, CA 92618			,	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
<b>,</b>				1765	
				DATE MAILED: 09/30/2004	;

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			N.S				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/761,993	CHEN ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	DuyVu n. Deo	1765					
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence addre	oss				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUN 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a and will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO tute, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this commandandoned (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21	January 2004.						
2a)☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)☒ Th	nis action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal ma	tters, prosecution as to the m	erits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) is/are pending in the applica	tion.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	l/or election requirement.						
Application Papers		·					
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.						
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 January 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeya	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	•						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	ed Office Action or form PTO-	·152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	gn priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	anto have been received						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
<ul> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage</li> </ul>							
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	•						
			_				
Amashmana/a\			•				
Attachment(s)  1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗍 Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
2) DNotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	o(s)/Mail Date	-0,				
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	(8) 5) ☐ Notice of 6) ☐ Other:	Informal Patent Application (PTO-15	02)				

Application/Control Number: 10/761,993

Art Unit: 1765

## DETAILED ACTION

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ji et al. (US 6,787,409) and admitted prior art.

Ji describes a method for forming STI comprising: providing a substrate having a pad oxide 12, a mask 14, and a trench 11 wherein the trench is formed by exposing a portion of the pad oxide and the mask layer (col. 3, line 40-55; col. 4, line 20-23); forming a oxide layer 16 on the trench surface (col. 4, line 38-42); forming an oxide isolation layer by HDP-CVD process to completely fill the trench in two-step process wherein the bias of the second step is higher than the first step (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 45); removing the oxide isolation layer over the trench (col. 6, line 1-4). Even though Ji is silent about the deposition to etching ratio of the second step is lower than the deposition to etching ratio of the first step; however, he describes the same process of using a higher bias in the second step, which would provide a lower deposition to etching ratio in the second step. Unlike claimed invention, Ji doesn't describe the steps of removing the mask and pad oxide layer. however, these steps are known to one skilled in the art during the process of forming STI as shown here by admitted prior art, page 2, paragraph [0005] of the specification. One skilled in the art would find it obvious at the time of the invention in

Application/Control Number: 10/761,993

Art Unit: 1765

light of the admitted prior art to further removing the mask and pad oxide layers in order to form a STI with a reasonable expectation of success.

Referring to claims 2 and 4, Ji doesn't describe the first bias power is in the range of 900-2500 W, which would provide a deposition to etching ratio of about 10-20. However, he teaches that the bias varies depending on factors such as thermal oxide layer thickness (col. 5, line 8-10). Therefore, one skilled in the art would find it obvious to determine the bias depending on the thermal oxide layer and through routine experimentation in order to provide optimum bias power and the corresponding deposition to etching ratio to form the isolation with a reasonable expectation of success.

Referring to claims 3, 5, 6the second bias power is from 1000-3000W (col. 5, line 35-40), which would provide a deposition to etching ratio of about 5-10.

Referring to claims 8 and 9, admitted prior art further describes the mask includes a bottom nitride and a top silicon oxide layers wherein the step of removing the isolation layer over the trench including removing the top oxide layer (page 2, paragraph [0005] of the specification).

3. Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ji and admitted prior art, and further in view of Huang et al. (US 6,653,203).

Unlike claimed invention, above applied prior art doesn't describe a step of etching-back to the mask layer to pull back the mask layer. Huang teaches a method for forming STI wherein he teaches of a step of etching to pull back the mask layer (col. 4, line 29-36). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to modify above applied prior art in light of Huang's

Art Unit: 1765

teaching of pull back the mask layer because it would reduce gate oxide thinning when the nitride layer or mask layer is subsequently removed (col. 1, line 45-49).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DuyVu n. Deo whose telephone number is 571-272-1462. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:00-2:30 Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine Norton can be reached on 571-272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Primary Examiner Duy-Vu N. Deo 9/26/05